REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-20 are presently pending in the application. Claims 1, 7-9, and 11 have been amended. Claims 16-20 are new. Claims 1 and 11 are independent claims. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the rejections in view of the Amendments and the following Remarks.

Double Patenting

Claims 1, 7, and 11 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 7 of U.S. Patent No. 6,834,049 to Tomar et al. (hereafter Tomar). Without conceding the appropriateness of this rejection, a terminal disclaimer is been filed concurrently herewith in order to disclaim the terminal part of any patent granted on the present application that extends beyond the full patent term of Tomar. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw this rejection.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 11, 12, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0131442 to Garg et al. (hereafter

Garg). The Examiner further rejected claims 1-7, 10, 13, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garg. Furthermore, the Examiner rejected claims 8 and 9 under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garg in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,841,771 to Irwin (hereafter Irwin).

Without conceding the appropriateness of any of the above rejections, Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 11 to more clearly distinguish the claimed invention over the cited references.

Specifically, independent claim 1 has been amended to recite an array of cells operably connected according to a sequence, in which each cell includes a latch for selecting one or more bits from a bit stream. Amended claim 1 also recites that at least one of the cells is coupled to receive one or more bits output by a previous cell in the sequence.

As amended, independent claim 11 recites a method involving a cell implemented in an array of sequentially connected cells. Specifically, claim 11 recites selecting one or more bits from a bit stream to be latched within the implemented cell, and receiving at the implemented cell one or more bits output by a previous cell in the sequence.

Support for these amendments can be found in the present specification at, e.g., Figs. 10 and 12; page 30, lines 5-11; page 31, lines 14-18.

Applicants respectfully submit that the abovementioned features are neither taught nor suggested by Garg and Irwin, either taken alone or in combination.

In the rejection, the Examiner relies upon elements 701 and 710 in Garg's selection block 701 (Fig. 7) to teach the claimed multiplexer and latch of claim 1. Thus, based on the Examiner's interpretation of Garg, it is clear that Garg's selection block 701 is analogous to the claimed cells.

However, Garg fails to disclose that the selection blocks are operably connected in sequence. Instead, Garg expressly discloses that a separate selection block 701 is provided for each of a plurality of locations in the output bit map 706. Garg fails to disclose any type of connection between the selection blocks whereby one selection block receives data from another. Applicants submit that there is no explicit disclosure in Garg that the selection blocks in Fig. 7 receives data from anywhere other than the disassemblers 140. See, e.g., Fig. 7; paragraphs 0043 - 0044 (pages 4-5).

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Garg fails to disclose the claimed array of cells operably connected

according to a sequence. Furthermore, Garg fails to disclose that a cell in the array receives one or more bits output by a previous cell in the sequence, as required by claims 1 and 11. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that Irwin fails to remedy the abovementioned deficiencies of Garg with respect to independent claims 1 and 11.

As such, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 11 are allowable over Garg and Irwin, either taken alone or in combination, at least for the reasons set forth above. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 2-10 and 12-15 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on claims 1 and 11. Thus, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw each of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103.

New Claims

Claims 16-20 are newly added to the present application. It is respectfully submitted that the filing of these new claims does not add any new subject matter to the application. These claims are supported in the specification at, e.g., page 30, lines 5-11. It is respectfully submitted that claims 16-20 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on allowable independent claims 1 and 11.

Conclusion

Since the remaining patent cited by the Examiner has not been utilized to reject the claims, but to merely show the state of the art, no comment need be made with respect thereto.

Entry of the Amendment After Final is respectfully requested. In view of the above amendments and remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the outstanding rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance in the present application.

Should the Examiner believe that any outstanding matters remain in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Jason W. Rhodes (Reg. No. 47,305) at the telephone number of the undersigned to discuss the present application in an effort to expedite prosecution.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By_____
Michael R. Cammarata, #39,491

MRC/JWR

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000